

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.24626 of 2019

=====

Bebi Kumari, Wife of Sri Anil Kumar Singh, Resident of Village and P.O.-
Bishunpur Bathua, Via- Dighra, P.S.- Pusa, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Director I.C.D.S., Bihar
3. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector Samastipur
4. The District Programme Officer Samastipur
5. The Child Development Project Officer Pusa, Samastipur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha (GA-7)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 17-01-2020 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. An order dated 12.09.2019, passed by the District Programme Officer, Samastipur has been put to challenge in the present writ application, whereby the petitioner's claim for her engagement as *Anganbari Sevika*, on the basis of a panel prepared in 2015, has been rejected.

3. It is the petitioner's claim that pursuant to an advertisement, the petitioner had participated in the process of selection for the post of *Anganbari Sevika* of Centre No. 43, Pusa Project of the district of Samastipur. She was selected but because of deliberate inaction of the Child



Development Project Officer, Pusa she was not formally engaged.

4. From the pleadings in the writ application and on perusal of the impugned order it transpires that for the first time she approached the District Programme Officer, Samastipur raising her grievance in 2018. Apparently, she was claiming her engagement on the basis of a panel prepared in 2015. The District Programme Officer has referred to Clause 8.14 of the Guidelines issued by the Directorate of ICDS, Welfare Department, Government of Bihar in 2011 regulating engagement of *Anganbari Sevika* which prescribed that a merit-list shall be valid for a period of three years only. In the meanwhile, admittedly, new Guidelines have been issued in 2019 prescribing new procedure for selection and adjudicating the disputes.

5. Since the panel itself has expired and the petitioner approached the competent authority under the Guidelines after expiry of the panel, no relief as sought can be granted, as I do not find any illegality in the impugned order.

6. Considering the petitioner's own laches in approaching the competent authority against delay in her



engagement as *Anganbari Sevika*, I am not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner.

7. This application is accordingly dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Rajesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

